

CANDOUR *The British Views-Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLIII No 4

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

April 1991

The A.B.C. of Politics

THE GRADUALISM OF THE REVOLUTION

by Rosine de Bouneville

AS with Ian Smith, the verbal opposition of Mrs Thatcher to the prevailing "winds of change" in their respective countries has conferred heroic status in the annals of Right-wingism everywhere. They are both worshipped as political martyrs who did their best against impossible odds. Anyone holding a contrary view is dismissed as a prejudiced crank or, more gently, as one overdoing the conspiracy theory of history through misplaced zeal. The present writer figures in both categories, but remains of the same opinion still!

"It is all of a piece," as the cook said in some forgotten thriller. The mysterious Power that purports to establish universal hegemony in defiance of the Creator's Word and will for fallen humanity's salvation and celestial destiny has pursued that aim by much the same method since our first parents' expulsion from Eden. Always the ultimate attainment has been periodically frustrated, not by contemporaneous society but by the wrath of God. So gradual and devious have been the recurring campaigns of successive pawns of the Devil in pursuit of his aspiration to world domination that nearly always "the little victims play," ignoring the evidence of approaching doom and disregarding any divinely inspired prophets sent to warn them.

Emerging Pattern

In 1529 England was still a Catholic kingdom, despite Luther, Calvin or whoever else set up as the latest light of the world. Then the pattern began once more to emerge. The ambitions of a lustful, profligate king and a cold-hearted wanton opened Pandora's box.

In pursuit of his desires, Henry VIII forgot that he, like Pilate, would have no power if it "was not given him from above." With his abrogation of the power given to the Vicar of Christ on earth, he made the monarchy subservient, in the first instance, to the receivers of the wealth stolen from the Church, and subsequently to the bankers of those same receivers. He murdered, more or less legally, the only two far-sighted enough to visualise the end result of his abrogation: John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Thomas More, erstwhile Chancellor of England. The unity of Christendom was shattered into myriad sects. Faith and charity were in eclipse and even hope died at last.

If all the bishops had seen what the dire result their "patriotic" obedience (if that is what it was) would have, would they have taken that first step on the long shuffle to the new paganism? Alas, they

saw no harm in accepting their king as head of the Church in England. When in due time the Church in England became the Church of England, it was too late. The lay Catholics of England and the "hedge" priests died for their faith in their hundreds: the landed gentry were either martyred or fined into exile or apostasy. The "new rich" clung to their ill-gotten gains through restorations and regicide, evolving into the die-soft Tory "opposition" of today. Usurers returned and by the end of the seventeenth century had annexed the royal monopoly of the issue of credit. The Money Power ruled again.

It took four hundred years to turn Christendom into the multi-religious and multi-racial stew that is Europe today. It took rather less time to destroy the intervening **imperial substitutes**, for the labourers in the colonial vineyards were quite as gullible as their predecessors. If they survived the Money Power's tactical wars, they were too bemused with phantom victories to do anything other than bow before the "winds of change" despite all the latter day Fishers and Mores who told them to beware of the hurricane behind the zephyr.

The Message Of Fatima

The last warning was given to three young shepherds in Portugal more than seventy years ago. With the miracle of the sun to help them, they did their best to persuade their fellow-countrymen to obey the exhortation to "pray for the conversion of Russia" and to believe the warning of the chaos that would follow a failure so to do. Though one of the shepherds is still living, the warning and the message have been shrouded in official silence. Far from praying for the conversion of anyone, let alone Russia, both pastors and people for the most part are busy acting on the palpably false assumption that Man is doing very well for himself, thank you. The unfortunate disorders today are merely temporary hiccups on the progression to universal justice and peace in the New World Order.

So now we are on the last lap. Are professing Christians really going to continue "doing their own (sectional) thing" until they find themselves so helplessly corrupt as to be fit for nothing but the slave quarters in this life and the fires of Hell in the next?

Surely not. There is still time. Remember: "the days will be cut short for the sake of the elect."

DON'T MISS IT! - Nationalist symposium on the evening of Saturday, 25th May in Central London. Four different speakers with one idea: to make this country a better place in which to live. Tickets £2.50 each from Steven Books, 10 Lincoln Way, Enfield, Middlesex EN1 1TE.

AVAILABLE FROM CANDOUR TAPES

David Irving at the Clarendon Club	Fr. Charles Coughlin On The Air
David Duke on the Donahue Show	G.K. Chesterton Broadcasts and Poems
Rhodesian Independence Broadcasts	Mosley Speaks at Stowe School
A.K. Chesterton Speaks	The Mass at Downham Market
	N.F. at Rotherham

£4 each from CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

JOHN GALSWORTHY AND THE BOMBING OF IRAQ

by Bernard Smith

IMPROBABLE as it may seem, there is a connection between the author of **The Forsyte Saga** and the American bombing of Iraq. On 7th April 1911, **The Times** published a letter from Galsworthy whose text I reproduce:

"Sir - Of all the varying symptoms of madness in the life of modern nations the most dreadful is this prostitution of the conquest of the air to the ends of warfare. If ever men presented a spectacle of sheer inanity it is now - when, having at last triumphed in their struggle to subordinate to their welfare the unconquered element, so heroically mastered, they have straightaway commenced to defile that element by filling it with engines of destruction.... Is there any thinker alive watching this still preventable calamity without horror and despair? Horror at what must come of it, if not promptly stopped; despair that men can be so blind, so hopelessly and childishly the slaves of their own marvellous inventive powers. Was there ever so patent a case for scotching at birth a hideous development of the black arts of warfare; ever such an occasion for the powers in conference to ban once and for all a new and ghastly menace?

A little reason, a grain of commonsense, a gleam of sanity before it is too late - before vested interests and the chains of a new habit have enslaved us too hopelessly. If this fresh devilry be not quenched within the next few years it will be too late. Water and earth are wide enough for men to kill each other on. For the love of the sun, and stars, and the blue sky, that have given us all our aspirations since the beginning of time, let us leave the air to innocence! Will not those who have eyes to see, good will towards men, and the power to put that good will into practice, bestir themselves while there is yet time, and save mankind from this last and worst of all its follies?"

Coventry, Dresden And Hiroshima

I imagine that few of us can read that letter without a pensive sigh - a Peter Pan wish for a world of make-believe. Poor old John Galsworthy! The world isn't like that. The rest of us must pull ourselves together and get on with the real business of living. Yet Galsworthy died in 1933. He did not live to see the bombing of Guernica, Warsaw, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Berlin, Coventry, Dresden, Hiroshima... and Baghdad. It was and it is as terrible as he predicted. Yet there is no end to it. And there is no end to the ingenuity that justifies it.

I read somewhere recently that in the first nineteen days of bombing Iraq a greater tonnage of high explosive was dropped than fell in Germany during the whole of the Second World War. I do not know if that is so, but it made me think of that earlier war and the bombing of German cities. We did not know at the time that there was a deliberate policy of bombing centres of civilian population in German cities to inflict as many casualties and as much terror as possible. Many people who lived through that war are still unwilling to admit this fact. Their defensive anger does them credit: they know that a war must be fought for a just cause and must be fought honourably - and that does not include killing and terrorising civilians. Unhappily, our war leaders never felt the same.

Sir Charles Portal, Marshal of the Royal Air Force, wrote to a colleague on 5th August 1941: "The Prime Minister has repeatedly declared during recent weeks and ever since Russia came into the war that our policy should be to attack centres of population." The following year he addressed this minute to Air Vice-Marshal Bottomley: "Ref. the new bombing directive: I suppose it is clear that the aiming points are to be the built-up areas, not for instance the dockyards or aircraft factories... This must be made quite clear."

Bomber Harris, boss of Bomber Command, set out to destroy sixty leading German cities. He claimed a destruction rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cities a month and by the end of 1944 had destroyed 45. On 28th March 1945, Churchill sent the following minute to General Ismay: "It seems to me that the moment has come when the question of bombing German cities simply for the sake of increasing the terror, though under other pretexts, should be reviewed otherwise we shall come into control of an utterly ruined land... I feel the need for more precise concentration upon military objectives...rather than on mere acts of terror and wanton destruction, however impressive."

A Bunker In Baghdad

I have taken these extracts from a source that is, I think, above suspicion of bias: **The Strategic Air Offensive Against Germany 1939-45**, by Sir Charles Webster and Noble Frankland (HMSO, 1961). We knew nothing of this at the time, but discovered it many years later by patient searching. For this reason the bombing of Iraq gives cause for disquiet. We are told that new technology has made bomb aiming much more precise than it was in the Second World War, enabling civilian casualties to be kept to a minimum. This implies a) that civilian casualties in the last war were accidental, which has been proved to be untrue, b) that civilians would not be deliberately bombed in this war.

In mid-February a bunker in Baghdad was bombed causing, so the Iraqis claimed, 500 civilian deaths. Iraq said it was an air-raid shelter. Washington said it was a military HQ. We are unlikely to know the truth for many years. Max Eastman, writing in the **Daily Telegraph** on 14th February, recalled the killing of half-a-million German civilians in the Allied bombings in the Second World War and the justifications used: "The Germans had begun the destruction...a war of national survival...grim military necessities..." And his article was headed: "THE TRAGIC PRICE TO PAY FOR DEFEATING SADDAM." Is the price too high?

In retrospect, it seems that neither the First nor the Second World Wars was worth the fighting. This is not the occasion to try to explain that statement, but we have to ask ourselves what we were defending, if it was worth defending, and at what cost to ourselves and, more importantly, to others. In my view the independence of Kuwait was not worth the blood that was spilt to defend it. Nor were American oil supplies. As for Israel, she is perfectly able to take care of herself, as any Israeli will tell you. Britain has no business to be in the Middle East from where she was only too glad to extricate herself at one time. Her foreign policy should once again be dictated to by benign self-interest. But that would require her to get out of the United Nations, which seems very unlikely.

But this is to stray from my course. We began with Galsworthy's protest against man becoming the victim of his own horrific inventions. His

protest went unheeded as all such protests must. The driving force of our Western civilisation is the exploration and consummation of man's powers. We are infatuated with our own cleverness. We want to surround ourselves with machines that speak to us of our ingenuity and power - we cannot even whisk an egg by hand but must have a machine to do it for us. Our technological world is a mirror that reflects back at us the flattering self-created image of ourselves. We are, as John Galsworthy says, "blindly and hopelessly and childishly the slaves of our own inventive powers." Necessarily we lack all wisdom. Necessarily we have discarded even those moral restraints that so-called "primitive" societies valued. We are blind to our own moral decadence.

Can this be called a Christian civilisation? Surely not. Galsworthy, like so many of his class, had forsaken Christianity and pinned his hopes on liberalism. Many "Christians" are in the same position without realising it; they have sanctified liberal ideals. But some Christians recognise the deeply irreligious character of our civilisation which has blasphemously substituted the Image of Man for the Image of God. Like the first Christians in the Roman Empire, they will have to consider what services they owe, if any, to a pagan state.

BERNARD SMITH is Editor of **A Half Open Eye**, a quarterly newsletter available for £2 p.a. from 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, Sussex BN11 4BP.

IS THIS PLANE A SYMBOL?

La Tribune de l'Expansion is a French financial journal that could never be suspected of anti-semitism, but in its issue of 26th July last year it dropped a bombshell:

A PLANNED SOVIET-ISRAELI-US PLANE IS A REALITY

The USSR, the US and Israel have launched a plan for a joint air-liner. The USSR will manufacture the body, the US the engine and Israel the navigation system, according to Vadislav Malkevitch, Chairman of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce, as reported by Radio Israel.

At the start of his visit yesterday to study the possibilities in Israel, Vadislav Malkevitch said that, in anticipation of their joint effort, co-operation between his country, the US and Israel had begun in earnest six months before. According to the radio, the initiative had come from Israel's aeronautical industry. Investment had been supplied by the Israeli businessman, Saul Eisenberg, the British [sic] press magnate, Robert Maxwell, and the Canadian [sic] Reichman family.

This astonishing Israeli-Soviet-American scheme corresponds exactly with another plan being realised on a much vaster scale: that organisation of society being prepared for us by the one-worlders for the beginning of the 21st century. The project is so similar that it makes it impossible not to believe in the other plan affecting all levels: the Soviet body, the American engine and the Israeli navigation system.

THE RIGHT TO PROPERTY

by Paul Matthews

ONE hundred years ago, Pope Leo XIII issued an encyclical letter called **Rerum Novarum**. It condemned the social system under which "working men have been surrendered, isolated and helpless, to the hard-heartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition." In standing out against the unbridled individualism favoured by Capitalism, he argued that property should be widely diffused and the monetary system so arranged as to facilitate the production, distribution and exchange of goods and services. A return by the Church to this type of traditional social teaching would provide precisely the kind of effective spiritual lead that is missing from its pronouncements today. In this article, the writer explores **Rerum Novarum** and another social encyclical, **Quadragesimo Anno**.

There is an argument put forward from time to time — by some who know little, and others who ought to know better — that there is a fundamental incompatibility between contemporary British nationalism and Christianity. It is at once both more and less than an argument: it is an *assertion*; and like all too many assertions is really a mere *assumption*.

It is an assumption that in the hands of the uninformed and misinformed becomes a dogma, held all the more dogmatically on account of its shallowness.

Mercifully, the subject is too vast to be dealt with in a single article; but two facts emerge from and dominate it. The first is that present-day radical British nationalism and Christianity are not incompatible. The second fact is that in certain areas — most clearly in economics and in opposition to abortion — such nationalism is the only political option that is truly compatible with Christianity. It is the aim of this article to examine this compatibility in relation to aspects of economics.

Now before such a discussion can be set underway it is necessary to clear away the possibilities of confusion by making clear the route of advance; for this much must be accepted at the outset: that there is as little unity in economics as in theology amongst the many Christian sects, some of which indeed — most notably those of Calvinist derivation — are strongly supportive of capitalism, and even creative of it.

This article will make no attempt to weave a way through such a diversity, but instead takes to itself the liberty solely to pursue the thread of Catholic teaching. It will take this course for two reasons: firstly, because the writer, as a Catholic, knows a little more about this than about Protestant teachings; and secondly because whilst there is no one Protestant scheme of economics (but a great

deal of divergence amongst the many Protestant denominations) there is a clear and consistent set of principles advanced by the Catholic Church, which principles are succinctly and powerfully set out in the two great Papal encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. There is a third reason: that a consideration solely of these two documents makes possible an article short enough to make sense.

THE WORKERS CHARTER

It was in response to the growth of industrial capitalism and Marxian socialism that Pope Leo XIII in 1891 addressed to the Church his letter *Rerum Novarum* ('The Workers' Charter'). In it he stated the problem in this way:

"... The ancient working-men's guilds were abolished in the last century, and no other protective organisation took their place ... Hence by degrees it has come to pass that working-men have been surrendered, isolated and helpless, to the hard-heartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition. The mischief has been increased by rapacious usury ..."

Having thus set the scene, the Pope went on to consider the socialist remedy for this situation; and, after demonstrating its necessary failure, proceeded to outline the remedy proposed by the Church.

The essence of the Pope's rejection of Marxism as a remedy or the evils of capitalism lies in this: that it in no way benefits ordinary working people; but, on the contrary, enslaves them just as surely as does capitalism. Under capitalism Big Business controls the State; under socialism the State controls Big Business; they are just two different perspectives of the same situation, expressed by the fact that Marxian socialism is merely State Capitalism.

Rerum Novarum thus isolates the following

points in condemnation of Marxism:

(i) That Marxism does not improve the lot of the worker, since it is in reality a more total form of capitalism;

(ii) That it denies private property, such denial being contrary to natural law: "For", the Pope says, "every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own."

(iii) That Marxism is destructive of the family; since it is, by natural law, for parents — and not the State — to provide for the needs and the future of their children; and

(iv) That Marxism makes the State all-powerful, which is a moral evil; since by natural law society — the small society of a man's family, and the wider society of the national community — take precedence over the State, for it precedes the State.

Disposing thus of Marxism, *Rerum Novarum* proceeds to the true alternative to capitalism:

"The first and most fundamental principle . . . must be the inviolability of private property".

Now private property is a thing entirely different from capitalism, which may rather be called private *enterprise*: it is different from capitalism, and in a death-struggle with capitalism. Private property means possession: capitalism means *dispossession*. Private property means well-distributed property privately held by the general public: capitalism means the public's property being privately *withheld*, by millionaires if not by generals.

This championship of private property by the Church was no new departure: on the contrary, it has been Her traditional teaching (the great philosopher-theologian St. Thomas Aquinas wrote in the 13th century: "It is lawful for a man to hold private property; and it is also necessary for human existence."); and is supported by Holy Scripture. Its especial value is threefold:

1. It is the most efficient means by which the abundance of nature can be made available for man;

2. It is a necessary support to family life; and

3. It is essential for man's liberty and independence from the State.

From this discussion on private property the Pope goes on to consider the relationship between employer and employed, and dismisses as perverse the Marxist doctrine of class-war:

"The great mistake is to take up with the notion that class is naturally hostile to class . . . the direct contrary is the truth . . . in a State it is ordained by nature that these two classes should dwell in harmony and agreement, so as to maintain the balance of the body politic."

The employee thus has a duty to perform his work with honesty and diligence; whilst

the employer has a duty to accord his workers respect and dignity in terms of wages and the nature of the work to be done. It is from this section, largely inspired by the great champion of British working folk, Cardinal Manning, that the encyclical takes its English name: '*The Workers' Charter*'; yet although it is the response of the Church to the growth of industrial capitalism in the last century it is nevertheless an expression of the traditional teaching of the Church, based on St. Thomas who 600 years earlier had taught that a degree of material well-being is necessary for a person to live a virtuous life.

The especial importance, however, of *Rerum Novarum* lies in this: that in accepting the necessity of private property, it distinguishes between its proper use and its abuse: for it is one thing to have the right to possess property, and quite another to have the right to use it however one wishes.

Ownership thus has a two-fold aspect: individual, insofar as it relates to its private owner; and social, insofar as it relates to the common good.

It is only here — where it is necessary for the promotion of the common good — that the State has a part to play; but it is a part which the State must not overstep:

"The State has the right to control its use (i.e. the use of property) in the interests of the public good alone, but by no means to absorb it altogether."

BOUNDARY OF STATE

It is essential that this boundary should not be overstepped, for as the Church has constantly taught: society exists for man; man does not exist for society. This latter error — the use of man merely as a unit of production for the benefit of others — is at the very root of both capitalism and communism; and it is this which the Church strictly condemns.

As an essential, therefore, of human freedom as much as prosperity, it is necessary firstly that private property should be held to be sacred and inviolable; and secondly, that it should be distributed as widely as possible:

"The law . . . should favour ownership, and its policy should induce as many as possible of the people to become owners."

The second great papal encyclical on economics — *Quadragesimo Anno* — was addressed to the Church by Pope Pius XI in 1931, in response to the banking crisis and depression in 1929. Its emphasis is thus largely upon finance; but the major importance of this encyclical is that it takes up the principles of cooperation in society and balance within the body politic (which principles were touched upon in *Rerum*

Novarum and mentioned above) and develops the theory of corporatism.

HEALTHY BALANCE

Quadragesimo Anno is thus the encyclical that sets out the case for the Christian Corporative State, which envisages a three-way partnership between owners, employees and the State as essential for maintaining a healthy balance and true social order: a balance anticipated in fascist ideology but sadly missed in Italy under Mussolini, where the State appropriated too much power.

Again, the principles of corporatism are not new: they are an application of the traditional Catholic concept of **order**, defined by St. Thomas as "the unity arising from the proper arrangement of a number of objects." In *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pope Pius XI puts it in this way:

"Just as the unity of human society cannot be built upon opposition between classes, so the proper ordering of economic life cannot be left to free competition . . . Still less can this function be exercised by economic dictatorship . . . the institutions of public and social life must be imbued with the spirit of justice . . . Social charity should be, as it were the soul of the order."

As a practical basis for such order – as the framework upon which the Corporative State is to be built – the Pope explains that the principle of **subsidiary function** ("a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable") must be followed.

What 'subsidiary function' means is this: that it is a disturbance of right order for any higher association (e.g. the State) to perform functions which can efficiently be performed by smaller associations:

"The State therefore should leave to smaller groups the settlement of business of minor importance, which otherwise would greatly distract it; and it will thus carry out with greater freedom, power and success the tasks" (e.g. defence, law and order, main-

taining the balance of economic life for the common good) "belonging to it alone."

MATERIALIST ERROR

Quadragesimo Anno condemns Marxian socialism on the same grounds as did Pope Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum* – stressing the divisive nature of 'class-warfare'; and condemning the fact that Marxism, like capitalism, is based upon the materialist view that man is a mere economic creature, a unit of production.

Looking back to the economic forms and guild systems of the Middle Ages, the Pope sums up the core of the problem thus:

"... the highly developed social life which once flourished in a variety of organisations organically linked with each other has been damaged and all but ruined, leaving thus virtually only individuals and the State . . . Social life has entirely lost its organic form."

It is here that the very heart of the whole economic question lies: for economics, money, material goods, exist only for the good of man: of man not as a mere animal, a mere mouth and stomach; but man as a **person**. And since man, as all history and sound philosophy shows, is a communal being it is of the first importance that an economic system should provide not merely for his individual material needs, but that it should fit organically into the society in which he lives.

These are all principles which a radical nationalist – whatever his religious views – will readily understand, for he will recognise them substantially as his own. Alone amongst politicians – for he alone amongst them has the genuine good of the people as his goal – he knows, as did these great Popes, **that the restoration of organic society based upon private property is what is necessary; and that the problem of the property-less in capitalist society is best answered not by removing property, but by removing capitalism.**

GENERAL LEON DEGRELLE ON VIDEO! See Degrelle, founder of the Rexist movement and leader of the Wallonien Division, tell his story on a 90 minute VHS video (English translation overdubbed). £20 from FREEDOM VIDEOS, BM-TRUTH, LONDON WC1N 3XX.

Read SPEARHEAD – Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy 87p from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £8.00 OVERSEAS £10 U.S. \$20 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England. [Editor: Rosine de Bouneville]